



## DRAFT CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN I TO 2045; Comments from David Rance

1 message

David Rance [REDACTED]  
To: consultations@canterbury.gov.uk

8 January 2023 at 12:01

### DRAFT CANTERBURY DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN I TO 2045

Please find below my comments on the Draft Plan

With reference to the Rural Areas section from page 122:

#### Policy R1

Having read the R1 policy very carefully, I believe it is fundamentally flawed for many reasons at both local and national levels. **So the change required is that the policy should be scrapped.**

The main reasons for me (and this is not an exhaustive list) are:

Fundamentally, this scale of development would radically and irrevocably change the nature of the village of Adisham, given that it comprises more than a tenfold increase in the number of houses. And put simply- I do not believe it's possible (as stated in the policy) to "avoid coalescence" with Adisham village.

The necessary improvements to infrastructure to support the policy, not least water supply and road access, raise fundamental questions that have been "glossed over" rather than considered in the draft plan. I am particularly concerned about safety aspects relating to the B2046 and Adisham Downs Road, both of which are heavily used roads that already have safety issues.

Equally importantly, the proposal would consume a very significant amount of farmland at a time when the UK is trying to move towards greater self-sufficiency in food production. This is also against the background of the main landowners involved stating publicly they will not sell their land and that they were inadequately consulted in early discussions on the proposal.

From the employment viewpoint, Adisham is a small village with only a very few local ("niche") businesses who employ a handful of people. So how would this policy - in which a significant number of houses are aimed at working age people - attract residents other than by implicitly recognising they would have to travel to their workplaces with the consequent impact on transport congestion? Equally, any attempt to provide locally-based employment within the bounds of the new policy would destroy even further the character of Adisham.

Finally, I also believe that much of the original alleged rationale for the policy at local level (to paraphrase - "the government is telling us we have to do this") has been significantly eroded by the fact that Michael Gove (the relevant Secretary of State) has now agreed to drop mandatory, nationally imposed, housing targets, and replace them with advisory figures.

#### Policy R20

I believe this policy is flawed. **The change required is that it should be scrapped.** Some of the main reasons for me (and this is not an exhaustive list) are:

Fundamentally, this scale of development would radically and irrevocably change the nature of the village of Womenswold.

I am particularly concerned about safety aspects relating to the B2046, a heavily used road that already has safety issues, and even more so in the context of the proposed (and even more flawed) policy R1.

There is no evidence that this proposal has been thought through and harmonised with the Dover District Council plan.

Policy R22

I recognise the opportunity to site an additional small development in Adisham village. However, I believe the proposed site of this policy (near the junction of Station Road and Cooting Lane) is severely flawed. This is particular in view of its impact on safe traffic flow and pedestrian safety on Station Road. This is already hazardous as part of a "rat run" to Canterbury and in the context of parked cars. **The change required is to scrap this policy and consider alternative development opportunities of similar size**; one might be to extend (towards Pond Green) the line of social housing along Bossington Road.

Regards  
David Rance

